

out of site area

Bounding box - highlights important marine boundaries - and what would affect our impact inside or outside - used MO model, which would assess oil spills -  
SC - will + much addressed under DLL - did modeling for this - to see if they

- SC planning function - difference from what's in there

- John - plan to conduct due diligence comment period - tell " SC plan during MACC meeting

- think MO is doing whatever it can well to support lumber industry

- SC point - they need approvals for a source in NA (Lush Island)

should result in a checklist, red check

- largely open ended - in allowances - so they have to deal in detail

\* - MO - need allowances - all sources in NA by July - used allowing for all future sources

- SC - Lush Island issues by year after Hm DR

- if following guidance - use allowances for catalog

allowances (which is draft we do differently)

allowances - based on allowances from sources like in NA

area to all of NA

- SC performed this nodally - closed scope of

if receptors do not effect

- for allowances for all combined - 100%

- if no new - 100% - 100% exceed NAOs

around now, for = 0.4% of NA

plan - just listed those in SCIE RIE based on node they in this area

- detail rule - likely for future plans as far as in proposed SCIE Group

- high impact zone approach - only based on area around source -

- SC - this is notwithstanding that just isn't a major rule

all must be done end of year

- all assessments now down to be based on DSC study down to complete analysis for

- MO was on call to a committee - SCIE the should redrafts would follow along

4/19/15 Lush Island, Lethbridge, Mercure - no seafarers - this is only some clubs interested

May 11 Same Club/World

Meeting

①

SO - MO Delays on Lumber

- Since dooq - Rush has been taking Sox source from DRC - always the longer
- Sox source within NA & the rest of disintegrations
- About public service consumers doc - C Ruth Field March 2024 -
- Only sound is PCI file filing proposal - clear file serial # known
- About Sox non-public authority - need specific state park construction issues -
- SC concern is that this is similar to what we done legislative -
- After proposed downision - in case of new issue, file other a/c
- The last point is the how fit the high issue - in reality - should have no impact HS days later
- SC will comment on legislative materials - hard to monitor -
- Only problem now - can't be able to comment - but limited information
- requires public notice before Mo's 1, before STI comment - and no opportunity HS days later
- No want give silly docs until May 11 - so went forward
- in future
- SC - if you get clean docket will - if will be a hundred needed to do the same thing
- Otherwise - they were using certain route to CEN - didn't make (all unanswered)
- So never do by yourself - nonetheless it's a doable, etc. - this is why
- If find 1 model in that shows clean docket
- Jack - only ready enough for all knowledges us. Clean docket
- - recent model judgment
- Handy - NA guidance - allowable - if significant reason - should do better
- - director for better that source issue in backlog
- X - backlog record - soon to be in legal form - unless certain factors
- Clean docket - the actual consumer association non-regulatory one, backlog considered
- If modify draws the in compliance - if is clean
- If is your final answer - best to show, hold a set of notes, etc.

(3)

(3)

SC - big shift in clean data modeling has been using hourly variable rates

- they are only varying emission rates - not hourly shock temps, exit velocity, etc - seems like SO<sub>2</sub> fluctuations might be based on exit velocities - could impact analysis

- don't know if this data is even available (exit velocity, shock temps)

- also, basing it on 2008 net data - not current

- they say net data Nov 08-10 is representative of 10-12

- MJ - if clean data demonstration - we will evaluate to see if valid modeling

- CEM hourly is good - b/c real data - but will look @ other values

- but - our comments will be limited to plan before us

- Josh - SIP review 1) completeness - is it all there - within 60 days - no later than 6 months  
2) approachability - guidance, regulations (once complete - within 12 months)

- SC - consider evaluating concerns @ completeness stage - if they say on face that they aren't using alternatives - maybe it's not complete

- 100,000 people live in NA - it won't 12 months to review - that's 12 more months of people breathing bad air

- SC wants further conversation if clean data submission comes in

- concern about monitors in consent agreement - might not be achievable until 2018 - aerosol reductions are required for this SIP now

- think those monitors - it properly placed - will have violations

- Josh - we have insisted w/ MNR that we are involved in monitoring -

- today MNR comes out - regular collaboration

- also - should be included in monitoring network plan - allow opportunity for p.b.l.c. comment